

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 USC 102(e). This rejection is fully traversed below.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 13, and 19 have been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-21 are remain pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-21 UNDER 35 USC 102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 1-21 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Freivald et al., U.S. Patent 5,898,836. This rejection is fully traversed below.

Freivald et al. describes an Internet document change-detection tool. Freivald et al. determines whether a web page document has changed. In doing so, a CRC is used as a checksum value. If the checksum value for a re-fetched web page document differs from a previously stored checksum for an earlier fetch of the web page document, then a user is notified that a change has occurred. The checksum determines whether the web page document is identical to the web page document previously fetched.

Claim 1 pertains to detecting a need to update a prior registration of an on-line site provided on a network. In contrast, Freivald et al. indicates that a web page document can be “registered” for change detection. However, a user action to “register” of a web page document for change detection is distinct from “registration of an on-line site.” The registration of a web page in Freivald et al. is also not a registration with a governmental agency. Further, the ability to “register” a web page document for change detection in Freivald et al. merely indicates whether the web page document has changed (i.e., not identical), thus Freivald et al. fails to teach or suggest “determining the need to update the prior registration of the on-line site when the change value exceeds the threshold value” as recited in claim 1. In Freivald et al. there is

no notion of updating a registration. Instead, Freivald et al. merely notifies a user that a change in a web page document has occurred. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinct from Freivald et al.

Claim 6 pertains to a method for monitoring content of a website. Among other things, claim 6 recites “determining that a registration is needed for the website when the amount or degree of content change exceeds a predetermined threshold, the registration being with a governmental entity.” Freivald et al. fails to teach or suggest “that a registration is needed for the website when the amount or degree of content change exceeds a predetermined threshold.” In Freivald et al. there is no notion of a need for registration of a website with a governmental agency. Instead, Freivald et al. merely notifies a user that a change in a predetermined web page document has occurred. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 6 is patentably distinct from Freivald et al.

Claim 19 pertains to a method for determining whether a copyright registration update is needed. More particularly, claim 19 recites “comparing at least a portion of a website against a corresponding portion of an earlier stored version of the website that was previously subject to a copyright registration with a governmental entity to produce a change indication” (claim 19, lines 3-6). Freivald et al. has no teaching or suggestion of a copyright registration. Further, claim 19 recites “determining that the copyright registration update is needed for the website based on the change indication” (claim 19, lines 6-7). Freivald et al. teaches or suggests nothing about copyright registrations or determining the need to update a copyright registration. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 19 is patentably distinct from Freivald et al.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 6 and 19 are patentably distinct from Freivald et al. In addition, it is submitted that dependent claims 2-5, 7-18, 20 and 21 are also patentably distinct for at least the same reasons. The dependent claims contain additional limitations that further distinguish over Freivald et al.

For example, with respect to claim 4, Freivald et al. teaches nothing about a copyright registration. The Examiner alleges that “the registration of a website with any entity will literally read as a copyright registration” (Office Action, page 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees. At best, Freivald et al. teaches that a web page document can be “registered” for change detection. Nothing in Freivald et al. teaches or suggests anything about copyright registrations such as with the Copyright Office. The fact that a web page document can contain copyrighted material does nothing to teach or suggest a copyright registration.

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from Freivald et al. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 USC §102(e).

OTHER CITED REFERENCES

In the Office Action, the Examiner also cited, but did not apply, Giogau, U.S. Patent 5,983,351; Chow et al., 5,699,427; and Kahn et al., U.S. Patent 6,135,646. None of these references, alone or in combination, teach or suggests the claimed invention, even if combined with Freivald et al.

For example, there is no motivation to render a combination of Giogau or the other references with Freivald et al. Nothing or record would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Giogau with Freivald et al. Giogau describes a web site copyright registration system and method, and Freivald et al. describes a change-detection tool that detects changes in web page documents. Nothing, however, teach, suggests or motivates the combination of these references. Even if these reference were to be combined, neither reference is concerned with updating prior registrations (copyright registrations).

SUMMARY

It is submitted that claims 1-21 are patentably distinct from the cited references. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388.

Respectfully submitted,



C. Douglass Thomas
Reg. No. 32,947

Telephone: (650) 961-8300